

04/20/06

Sandralyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Bob Lenney [mothergoose@sbbmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2006 7:44 PM

To: KJMWEB

Subject: TV

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Please do everything possible to see that TV A La Carte programming comes about. Thank You Bob & Dee Dee Lenney

04/20/06

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Rosemary N. Palmer [floridalawlady@mstar2.net]
Sent: Monday, March 06, 2006 4:45 PM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate
Cc: corporate_communications@comcast.com
Subject: Ability to buy cable stations individually

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear FCC Commissioners and Florida legislators,

I thought you should know what Comcast's response to consumer desires to individually buy cable access consistent with their values and desires looks like in Tallahassee FL. Comcast announced that it was changing the least costly bundle by removing several family oriented programs. In addition, they included these stations with a package that includes MTV and another music video station that displays what many of us believe are soft core porn.

It doesn't sound at all like they have changed their ways, no matter what their statements to Congress a few months ago said. Please support legislation that require public service channels to be included in the lowest cost tier and permits customers to otherwise select and pay for those stations that they choose.

Rosemary N. Palmer
Tallahassee FL
850 668 9203

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Adrian Dolghier [dolghier@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 18, 2006 1:18 AM
To: KJMWEB
Cc: Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtayloratateweb
Subject: a la carte

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Mr. Kevin Martin,

From all the recently published press, I noticed that there is a lot of lobbying you encounter regarding "a la carte" concept you try to initiate. As a consumer I would like to express to you my full support, and make a comment about "a la carte" television.

Although the networks do oppose to the idea, for the consumers it's going to be great. I, including many of my friends, would like to have a choice, and not watch what's in the basic package. I personally like several channels such as History, HGTV, etc. however I'm not subscribed to them due to the inability to buy the expensive package. If I would have the possibility to buy them individually, I would probably have a smaller bill, and watch exactly what I and my entire family want. I don't really believe that there are occasional viewers for the stuff you don't really want. Even if I have Jerry Spring's show, I never watch it, just because I don't, simple! So, there is no such a big difference for consumers either they have them on TV or not. In addition, it will probably eliminate the unnecessary channels; if nobody watches them what difference does it make anyways!? Yes, I do realize that some good channels might be at risk, because of smaller audience, but I think the companies will have to be creative to find ways how to stay afloat or to bond together with other channels.

Please be tough and push the concept!

Yours truly,

Adrian Dolghier
Louisville, Kentucky

3/31/2006

Angela Boston

From: Jasonklugh02@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, March 30, 2006 8:38 AM
To: KJMWEB
Cc: Michael Copps
Subject: Cable Prices/rate hikes..cable profits

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Mr. Martin,

Congratulations so far on the moving of the needle to bring awareness to the public on the a la carte cable pricing. Do not be blindsided by the cable industries resistance and their adamant appeal that it will actually cost the consumer more. One avenue would also instill a limitation on what programmers can charge. Disney parent company of ESPN and ABC charge almost \$4 per subscriber for their programming while other cable networks are free for lengthy periods or only pennies per subscriber.

Interestingly enough, cable companies continue to insist it will cost the consumer more, yet here is a nice article that shows cable bonuses for the nation's largest cable company is capping bonuses to 12 million a piece...

Food for thought..

Reference
<http://www.philly.com/mld/inquirer/business/14209347.htm>

Comcast limiting bonuses at the top

By Akweli Parker

Inquirer Staff Writer

A new bonus plan for Comcast Corp.'s top executives has an annual ceiling of **\$12 million apiece**, the cable company said yesterday in a filing with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Comcast's chairman and chief executive officer Brian L. Roberts, chief operating officer Stephen B. Burke, founder and board director Ralph J. Roberts, co-chief financial officer Lawrence S. Smith, executive vice president David L. Cohen, and co-chief financial officer and treasurer John R. Alchin would be eligible under the 2006 plan, which still needs shareholder approval.

To receive the bonus, the executives must attain certain financial goals, such as increasing cash flow, as well as qualitative goals, including improved customer service, management effectiveness, and workforce diversity.

Brian Roberts received a 36 percent increase in salary, bonus and other compensation for 2005, according to a filing Friday with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

While the cable operator's shares fell 22 percent last year, Brian Roberts took in \$12.8 million: \$2.37 million in salary, a bonus of \$7.7 million, and other compensation of \$2.7 million.

Comcast's revenue increased 10 percent in 2005, to \$22.3 billion, and its profit fell 4 percent, to \$928 million. Its operating cash flow, a standard measure used to judge telecommunications firms' health, rose to \$8.5 billion, a 12.8 percent increase from 2004.

Contact staff writer Akweli Parker at 215-854-5986 or aparker@phillynews.com.

MORE NEWS FROM topix.net

- [Securities and Exchange Commission](#)
- [Corporate / Securities Law](#)
- [Law](#)
- [Discuss Law](#)

Angela Boston

From: Ellis Buell [ceb@gbis.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 29, 2006 10:19 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: a la carte satellite tv

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Mr. Martin,

Just a quick note to let you know I agree with your feelings about a la carte TV packaging as outlined in the ONSAT TV GUIDE. Some of the channels that could possibly be forced out of business by a la carte, obviously, would not be very popular, otherwise they would be selected by the consumer and not forced out of business. I believe the opponents to this concept are motivated strictly by money, not service. For example, one provider offers a \$200 package of over 50 channels of which I would watch approximately 5 and a few of these I cannot get without purchasing the entire offering. This makes them about \$40 per channel per year. I think this is a bit high.

Thanks for your efforts,
Ellis Buell

Angela Boston

From: jim27604@peoplepc.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2006 5:26 PM
To: Jonathan Adelstein
Subject: "Multi-Task Equal Access Cable".

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Jonathan Adelstein,

I am voicing my support of "Multi-Task Equal Access Cable". As a Christian I support the need for better TV selection. With all the negative TV destroying the minds of our citizens I support the need for "Multi-Task Equal Access Cable" So that we have more options for viewing Christian TV. I am disabled and have to sit in a recliner a lot of the time due to cancer surgery a few years ago. I would appreciate your support of "Multi-Task Equal Access Cable"

Sincerely,

Jim Fleet

Angela Boston

From: Brian Porter [bdporter3010@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 8:56 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Brian Porter (bdporter3010@hotmail.com) writes:

I want you to know that I support a la carte pricing of cable channels. I have just read an article abstract from USA Today about the cable industry criticizing the FCC's study supporting a la carte pricing of cable. I don't believe the cable industry's claim that it will increase pricing by \$20 dollars per channel, but even if it did, I support the idea of being able to choose my cable stations. I don't believe the Nielsens ratings and I think this will make channels more responsive to and diverse for the consumer. I personally don't read the newspaper because of lack of actual coverage and repetition of repetitive and monotonous soundbytes. I personally only watch one channel living with my parents. When I move out and get my own apartment, I will not buy cable unless a la carte pricing is available. I believe not only is this good for americans as consumers, but also as informed citizens. Thank you!!

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 4.89.184.208
Remote IP address: 4.89.184.208

Angela Boston

From: Craig D. Rogers [craigdrogers@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 22, 2006 10:49 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Craig D. Rogers (craigdrogers@gmail.com) writes:

Mr. Martin,

I am writing to voice my support for both "A La Carte Cable Programming" requirements and "Network Neutrality" regulations.

Both of these things are good for the consumer, who will not be fairly represented against the large telecom corporations. For example, I currently use VOIP telephones exclusively at my residence. Should Time-Warner (T-W) selectively control bandwidth, I would have no choice but to either switch to T-W as my VOIP provider (at twice the cost) or return to Bell South (again, at twice the cost).

Sincerely,

Craig D. Rogers
Shreveport, LA

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 24.170.114.54
Remote IP address: 24.170.114.54

Angela Boston

From: badgerdo [badgerdo@charter.net]
Sent: Wednesday, March 22, 2006 12:11 AM
To: dtaylor@tateweb
Subject: "a la carte" cable tv pricing

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Deborah,

I am in favor of "a la carte" cable tv pricing. I do not currently subscribe to cable tv, partly because I think its absurd for me to pay for channels that I will never watch. If "a la carte" were available, I would be a paying subscriber, buying the 3 channels that I want to watch (discovery, tlc, history).

Brian

Angela Boston

From: Adrian Dolghier [dolghier@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 18, 2006 1:18 AM
To: KJMWEB
Cc: Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtayloratweb
Subject: a la carte

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Mr. Kevin Martin,

From all the recently published press, I noticed that there is a lot of lobbying you encounter regarding "a la carte" concept you try to initiate. As a consumer I would like to express to you my full support, and make a comment about "a la carte" television.

Although the networks do oppose to the idea, for the consumers it's going to be great. I, including many of my friends, would like to have a choice, and not watch what's in the basic package. I personally like several channels such as History, HGTV, etc. however I'm not subscribed to them due to the inability to buy the expensive package. If I would have the possibility to buy them individually, I would probably have a smaller bill, and watch exactly what I and my entire family want.

I don't really believe that there are occasional viewers for the stuff you don't really want. Even if I have Jerry Spring's show, I never watch it, just because I don't, simple! So, there is no such a big difference for consumers either they have them on TV or not. In addition, it will probably eliminate the unnecessary channels; if nobody watches them what difference does it make anyways!? Yes, I do realize that some good channels might be at risk, because of smaller audience, but I think the companies will have to be creative to find ways how to stay afloat or to bond together with other channels.

Please be tough and push the concept!

Yours truly,

Adrian Dolghier

Louisville, Kentucky

Angela Boston

From: Adrian Dolghier [dolghier@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 18, 2006 1:18 AM
To: KJMWEB
Cc: Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtayloratweb
Subject: a la carte

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Mr. Kevin Martin,

From all the recently published press, I noticed that there is a lot of lobbying you encounter regarding "a la carte" concept you try to initiate. As a consumer I would like to express to you my full support, and make a comment about "a la carte" television.

Although the networks do oppose to the idea, for the consumers it's going to be great. I, including many of my friends, would like to have a choice, and not watch what's in the basic package. I personally like several channels such as History, HGTV, etc. however I'm not subscribed to them due to the inability to buy the expensive package. If I would have the possibility to buy them individually, I would probably have a smaller bill, and watch exactly what I and my entire family want.

I don't really believe that there are occasional viewers for the stuff you don't really want. Even if I have Jerry Spring's show, I never watch it, just because I don't, simple! So, there is no such a big difference for consumers either they have them on TV or not. In addition, it will probably eliminate the unnecessary channels; if nobody watches them what difference does it make anyways!? Yes, I do realize that some good channels might be at risk, because of smaller audience, but I think the companies will have to be creative to find ways how to stay afloat or to bond together with other channels.

Please be tough and push the concept!

Yours truly,

Adrian Dolghier

Louisville, Kentucky

Angela Boston

From: Annette Lang [annlanghfa@wideopenwest.com]
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2006 10:55 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Annette Lang (annlanghfa@wideopenwest.com) writes:

Mr. Martin:

Thank you for taking a stand against indecency that seems to be running rampant in broadcast TV. The reason we don't have cable pay movie channels is to keep the filth out of our home. It's a shame that "regular" TV is becoming as bad as cable. Please continue to hold these stations accountable to the public.

Also, I hope you will tackle the issue of ala cart cable TV soon. Thank you again.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 69.14.134.208
Remote IP address: 69.14.134.208

Angela Boston

From: Dick Gerber [dutchger@isp.com]
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2006 12:16 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: A la carte

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Kevin,

The following is a note I sent to the Communications Dept, NCTA.

It deals with the proposed TV a la carte program selection under consideration.
While the note is a bit of a rant, I hope it conveys at least, one consumer's opinion.

Dick Gerber

Nova, OH

I read the USA Today's article "Cable industry slams a la carte study."

In that article I read that:

*A Disney Exec. VP suggests all of the studies indicate the expanded basic bundle is the most efficient way to **sell programming**. (To hell with the consumer's preferences).*

*Another study (for Disney) suggests the price of ESPN would go to **\$20/month to stay on the air**. (Baloney).*

Another nut says consumers will need a digital set-top box adding to the cost of a la carte.

In my opinion, "industry hysterics" has struck the cable programmers and executives as suggested by the

article and you will say anything to retain status quo.

If you believe that in any way, shape or form the current, bundled programming is worth a rotten egg and the

consumer is satisfied with it, I'll buy your lunch.

Your only concern is assumed eyeballs and advertising dollars so you have filled the air with reruns that I

watched (for free) 25 years ago, music and jewelry sales, and idiotic sitcoms. You continue to raise prices &

increase frequency to cover the costs of exorbitant advertising and think you are doing us a favor.

I sincerely trust the free ride for you is over and the public will be able to sort and choose from among the pitiful offerings made available. Who knows, you may even have to begin to figure out how to reduce

outlandish advertising costs and frequency before consumers turn it all off.

Dick Gerber

Nova, OH

Angela Boston

From: Jim Perlman [James.Pperlman@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2006 8:39 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Jim Perlman (James.Pperlman@gmail.com) writes:

I applaud your plan to for cable companies to offer a la carte.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 24.218.183.63
Remote IP address: 24.218.183.63

Angela Boston

From: Claudette Beck [ratpack21@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2006 3:46 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Claudette Beck (ratpack21@sbcglobal.net) writes:

Dear Mr. Martin,
I recently read an article on cable al a carte. I have been asking the cable company Adelphia for quite some time for this as most of the channels they provide my husband and I don't watch. In Liberal Kansas I only have two choices for tv. Adelphia or Satelitte. I do NOT understand why cable companies can offer pkgs for 3 months at a lower price then up the bill. For me to get basic cable is now going to cost me 51.00 dollars a month after I get done with the lower price pkgs that they offer. Why can't they just charge a reasonable fee for cable each month instead of offering deals, creating a hassle and making us pay for channels we don't watch in the first place. That has always been the companies reason for upping the charge is to get even more channels we won't watch. I sincerely hope the al a carte goes through as I am tired of being overcharged. Thank you for listening. Sincerely Claudette Beck Liberal Kansas

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 67.66.106.100
Remote IP address: 67.66.106.100

Angela Boston

From: Jay.Ratnayake [Jay.Ratnayake@target.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2006 3:10 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: I support "a la carte" cable offering

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Sir,

I would like to support the FCC's initiative for "a la carte" cable offering. I believe that today's bundled cable offering is filled with fluff, no value, unsafe for our children, and gouges the cable customer.

I was formerly employed by Disney and was responsible for business planning and strategy, I'm fully aware of the intent for bundling, and it's not to offer the consumer any value. In my opinion, it was intended to fool advertisers and launch new products (stations, programs, and such). A la carte is available in other countries, why not the US.

Thanking you,

Sincerely,
-Jay

Angela Boston

RECEIVED

From: Mary [emzoco@verizon.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2006 1:10 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: TV ala carte

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Hold your ground. It is the only way I can elimiate trashy networks that provide trashy programs. Everytime they put one on the air I write and let them know about it. I also write you a lot as well to let you know many, many depending on you to bring morality into our living rooms.

Angela Boston

From: Jim McCracken [mccrackenjim@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2006 1:02 PM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtayloratateweb
Subject: a la carte

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

*Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary*

I would like to thank the FCC for standing by it's study showing the value of a la carte programming (USA Today 3/16/06). Our family has been boycotting cable & satellite TV until a la carte is an option. It really bothers me that I can't currently choose the programming I want to pay for and bring into my home. I urge the FCC to take every feasible step to make a la carte programming an option for American consumers.

Thank you.

Jim McCracken
Clarkston, WA

Do You Yahoo!?
Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around
<http://mail.yahoo.com>

Angela Boston

From: Jim McCracken [mccrackenjim@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2006 1:02 PM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtayloratateweb
Subject: a la carte

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I would like to thank the FCC for standing by it's study showing the value of a la carte programming (USA Today 3/16/06). Our family has been boycotting cable & satellite TV until a la carte is an option. It really bothers me that I can't currently choose the programming I want to pay for and bring into my home. I urge the FCC to take every feasible step to make a la carte programming an option for American consumers.

Thank you.

Jim McCracken
Clarkston, WA

Do You Yahoo!?
Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around
<http://mail.yahoo.com>

Angela Boston

From: Jim McCracken [mccrackenjim@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2006 1:02 PM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtayloratweb
Subject: a la carte

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

**Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary**

I would like to thank the FCC for standing by it's study showing the value of a la carte programming (USA Today 3/16/06). Our family has been boycotting cable & satellite TV until a la carte is an option. It really bothers me that I can't currently choose the programming I want to pay for and bring into my home. I urge the FCC to take every feasible step to make a la carte programming an option for American consumers.

Thank you.

Jim McCracken
Clarkston, WA

Do You Yahoo!?
Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around
<http://mail.yahoo.com>

Angela Boston

From: Jim McCracken [mccrackenjim@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2006 1:02 PM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtayloratweb
Subject: a la carte

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I would like to thank the FCC for standing by it's study showing the value of a la carte programming (USA Today 3/16/06). Our family has been boycotting cable & satellite TV until a la carte is an option. It really bothers me that I can't currently choose the programming I want to pay for and bring into my home. I urge the FCC to take every feasible step to make a la carte programming an option for American consumers.

Thank you.

Jim McCracken
Clarkston, WA

Do You Yahoo!?
Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around
<http://mail.yahoo.com>

Angela Boston

From: Raymond Pirrello [rpcp@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2006 10:26 AM
To: KJMWEB

RECEIVED

As a cable subscriber, I strongly support a la carte pricing. Users of cable service are entitled to a choice. We have been stuck with bundled service for too long. Please register my full support for a la carte pricing.

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Angela Boston

From: Michael Grubb [mgrubb6@adelphia.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2006 8:08 AM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtayloratateweb
Subject: Cable a la carte

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Dear Sirs and Madam,
Reading recent reports of a la carte, I am disturbed by what I read. ~~And I feel that it is important that you hear from a consumer, not a cable company and not some consumer lobbyist group that are made of academia types but are not in touch with the real world.~~

It should be clear that I am opposed to cable a la carte, and I feel that the studies, both those done by your department and those done by various cable/channel providers miss the essence of the problem. Let me address various points that the studies make.

1. Most, though not all, will be able to reduce cable bills with a la carte pricing.

I believe your study is hugely flawed in it's assessment of this point. I think a more accurate assessment would be to say that most consumers that are interested in fewer than a certain number of channels, say 5 for arguments sake, will be able to reduce their bill, but only by reducing their service. Cost per channel will rise undoubtedly. And in many cases, such as my family, our interest are diverse enough that I believe we would either end up paying more, or not getting what we like because of expense. We are a typical family I believe. I commonly watch, or flip between 7 or 8 channels (TLC, DISCOVERY [1-3], DIY Network, ESPN, ESPN2, and the local channels). My wife, while she has many of the same likes, doesn't care about ESPN or ESPN2, or even the local channels (which I watch for News). She however is much more of a movie buff than I. So she will watch AMC, Oxygen, HBO [1-7], and a couple of other movie channels that come in the package. Now my daughter really prefers (and we prefer her to watch) the Disney channel, toon disney, nickelodeon, and the kids discovery channel. Now I have always considered our family average, and many of our friends with children have similar likes. For us, even if each channel cost a mere 2 dollars each, we would pay \$40 dollars just for the channels, not including the service charges the provider (ours is Adelphia, soon to be Comcast) would charge just to deliver this. But all indications are that \$2 per channel is unrealistic. ESPN is saying \$20. I don't believe it, but I do believe that we will see something more like what HBO charges, about \$14 dollars extra a month for their channels.

2. Selection. Your study seems to imply that it will be good for smaller companies because people will be able to spend their dollars on that, instead of things they don't want.

The cost to start a cable station is staggering. Many don't make any money until a few years after their release, and it is because to make money, they not only have to be in a lot of homes to get the subscription fees back from the carriers, but because they have to achieve a certain amount of advertising, which they struggle with until they are in enough households and watched by enough people to bring their numbers up to a point where people are willing to advertise on their channel. Without bundling, many new channels would never even try. The deck would be too stacked. And even if they did try, most consumers would never find out about these channels. Sure, there would undoubtedly be some that would try and make it, but not many.

3. Finally, all the emphasis and blame for cost has been leveled at the channel providers with very little blame leveled at the providers such as Cox, adelphia, att, and Comcast. The assumption is that cable is expensive because the channel providers such as ESPN charge outrageous fees.

Ok, the truth is that cable providers are no angels. By offering a la carte, they will be able to charge whatever they like for channels, and they will make a mint. Service will also suffer. Honestly, will cable companies even be willing to provide service in a rural area like the one I live in if most subscribers only subscribe to 2 or 3 channels? The cost of maintaining a network in a sparsely populated area with low channels per set will be too expensive. Either the consumer will pay very expensive premiums for little selection, or will not be able to get service at all.

Bottom line is that both of your studies are wrong, but in the end, an a la cart system will hurt, I believe, more consumers than it will benefit. Is this a perfect world? No. Some will surely pay more than they should. But I believe that more will pay more for less service under an a la carte system than the current system.

Please, for once really consider the people. I know for government that is a little weird. And I know that many in government try to say they are listening to the people, but face it, most in government listen to lobbyist and Pac groups that pretend they represent the people but don't.

Thanks for your time,
Michael Grubb
St. Albans, VT